

Solar System planetary orbital motions and dark matter

L. Iorio, *FRAS*
Viale Unità di Italia 68, 70125
Bari, Italy
tel./fax 0039 080 5443144
e-mail: lorenzo.iorio@libero.it

Abstract

In this paper we explicitly work out the effects that a spherically symmetric distribution of dark matter with constant density would induce on the Keplerian orbital elements of the Solar System planets and compare them with the latest results in planetary orbit determination from the EPM2004 ephemerides. It turns out that the longitudes of perihelia ϖ and the mean longitudes λ are affected by secular precessions. The resulting upper bounds on dark matter density, obtained from the EPM2004 formal errors in the determined mean longitude shifts over 90 years, lie in the range $10^{-19} - 10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ with a peak of $10^{-22} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ for Mars. Suitable combinations of the planetary mean longitudes and perihelia, which cancel out the aliasing impact of some of the unmodelled or mismodelled forces of the dynamical models of EPM2004, yield a global upper bound of $7 \times 10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ and $4 \times 10^{-19} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, respectively.

Keywords: experimental tests of gravity, dark matter, orbital motion, planets, Solar System

1 Introduction

In this paper we exploit the latest accurate data on planetary orbit determination [1] in order to constraint the amount of dark matter present in the Solar System. To avoid possible misunderstandings, here we are not intending the amount of dark matter at the Solar System's position in the Galaxy; we are, instead, dealing with possible excess of dark matter above the galactic background density¹. Such excess is to be intended as coming

¹Such a galactic background density would not cause the perturbing effects on planetary motions discussed in this paper; it is believed to cause an overall acceleration toward the center of the Galaxy.

from dark matter gravitationally bound to the Solar System and partly from dark matter in the galactic halo focused by the solar gravitational potential.

Let us consider a distribution with spherically symmetric density $\rho_{\text{dm}}(r)$. The corresponding modification to the Newtonian gravitational potential can be cast in the form

$$U_{\text{dm}} = -\frac{G\mu(r)}{r}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$\mu(r) = 4\pi \int_0^r \rho_{\text{dm}}(r') r'^2 dr' \quad (2)$$

is the total mass of dark matter enclosed in a spherical region of radius r . In regard to the distribution of the dark matter, it is believed it comes from diffusion into the Solar System (or possibly it was already present when our planetary system was formed). Diffusion was studied, e.g. in [2, 3], but it turns out that in none of these papers the density distribution in the Solar System has been derived in a form suitable for the present paper. Thus, we will make the simplest choice, i.e. we will consider ρ_{dm} as constant. With this assumption $\mu = (4/3)\pi\rho_{\text{dm}}r^3$ and eq. (1) becomes

$$U_{\text{dm}} = -\frac{4}{3}\pi G\rho_{\text{dm}}r^2. \quad (3)$$

From it an entirely radial acceleration

$$\mathbf{A}_{\text{dm}} = \frac{8}{3}\pi G\rho_{\text{dm}}\mathbf{r} \quad (4)$$

occurs. Its effect on planetary motions, which is, of course, much smaller than usual Newtonian gravity, can straightforwardly be calculated within the usual perturbative schemes.

2 The impact of a spherically symmetric distribution of dark matter on the planetary orbits

The Gauss equations for the variations of the semimajor axis a , the eccentricity e , the inclination i , the longitude of the ascending node Ω , the argument of pericentre ω and the mean anomaly $\mathcal{M}$ of a test particle in the

gravitational field of a body M are

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{2}{n\sqrt{1-e^2}} \left[eA_r \sin f + A_t \left(\frac{p}{r} \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{de}{dt} = \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{na} \left\{ A_r \sin f + A_t \left[\cos f + \frac{1}{e} \left(1 - \frac{r}{a} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{di}{dt} = \frac{1}{na\sqrt{1-e^2}} A_n \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) \cos(\omega + f), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{d\Omega}{dt} = \frac{1}{na \sin i \sqrt{1-e^2}} A_n \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) \sin(\omega + f), \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{d\omega}{dt} = -\cos i \frac{d\Omega}{dt} + \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{nae} \left[-A_r \cos f + A_t \left(1 + \frac{r}{p} \right) \sin f \right], \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} = n - \frac{2}{na} A_r \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) - \sqrt{1-e^2} \left(\frac{d\omega}{dt} + \cos i \frac{d\Omega}{dt} \right), \quad (10)$$

in which $n = 2\pi/P$ is the mean motion², P is the test particle's orbital period, f is the true anomaly counted from the pericentre, $p = a(1-e^2)$ is the semilatus rectum of the Keplerian ellipse, A_r , A_t , A_n are the radial, transverse (in-plane components) and the normal (out-of-plane component) projections of the perturbing acceleration $\mathbf{A}$, respectively, on the frame $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}, \hat{\mathbf{t}}, \hat{\mathbf{n}}\}$ comoving with the particle.

If the perturbing acceleration is entirely radial, as it is the case for eq. (4), the Gauss equations reduce to

$$\frac{da}{dt} = \frac{2e}{n\sqrt{1-e^2}} A_r \sin f, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{de}{dt} = \frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{na} A_r \sin f, \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{di}{dt} = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{d\Omega}{dt} = 0, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{d\omega}{dt} = -\frac{\sqrt{1-e^2}}{nae} A_r \cos f, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} = n - \frac{2}{na} A_r \left(\frac{r}{a} \right) - \sqrt{1-e^2} \frac{d\omega}{dt}, \quad (16)$$

As a result, the inclination and the node are not perturbed by such a perturbing acceleration.

²For an unperturbed Keplerian ellipse it amounts to $n = \sqrt{GM/a^3}$.

By evaluating eq. (4) on the unperturbed Keplerian ellipse

$$r = \frac{a(1 - e^2)}{1 + e \cos f}, \quad (17)$$

inserting it into (11)-(16) and averaging them with

$$\frac{dt}{P} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{(1 - e^2)^{3/2}}{(1 + e \cos f)^2} df \quad (18)$$

one gets that only the argument of pericentre and the mean anomaly are affected by extra secular precessions

$$\left\langle \frac{d\omega}{dt} \right\rangle = \frac{4\pi G \rho_{\text{dm}}}{n} \sqrt{1 - e^2}, \quad (19)$$

$$\left\langle \frac{d\mathcal{M}}{dt} \right\rangle = -\frac{4\pi G \rho_{\text{dm}}}{n} \left(\frac{7}{3} + e^2 \right). \quad (20)$$

As a consequence, also the mean longitude $\lambda = \Omega + \omega + \mathcal{M}$, which is used for orbits with small inclinations and eccentricities as those of the Solar System planets, is affected by an extra secular rate

$$\left\langle \frac{d\lambda}{dt} \right\rangle = \frac{4\pi G \rho_{\text{dm}}}{n} \left(\sqrt{1 - e^2} - \frac{7}{3} - e^2 \right). \quad (21)$$

3 Confrontation with the latest data

3.1 The longitudes of perihelia

The obtained expressions are useful for comparison with the latest data on planetary orbits from the EPM2004 ephemerides [1]. A similar analysis was conducted in [4] by exploiting the determined extra-advances $\Delta\dot{\varpi}$ of the longitudes of perihelia ϖ of the inner planets [5]. By using the uncertainties $\delta(\Delta\dot{\varpi})$ released in [5], the authors of [4] obtained an upper bound on ρ_{dm} of $10^{-17} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ from Mercury and of $10^{-19} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ from the Earth and Mars. Note that eq. (19) yields for the perihelion advance, in units of 2π , after one full orbital revolution the same expression (5) of [4], apart from the eccentricity factor. Moreover, the constraints on ρ_{dm} obtainable for each planet separately with eq. (19) and the results of [5] fully agree with those of [4]. However, the following concern about the reliability of the estimates by the authors of [4] is in order. The extra-perihelion advances determined in [5] are affected, in general, by all the Newtonian and non-Newtonian

features of motion which have not been accounted for in the dynamical force models of EPM2004. Among them there are certainly the totally umodelled general relativistic gravitomagnetic field, which induces the Lense-Thirring planetary precessions, and the solar quadrupole mass moment J_2 which, instead, was included in EPM2004, but it is currently affected by a $\sim 10\%$ uncertainty. For a discussion of such issues in a different context see [6]. Each planetary perihelion is, thus, affected by such residual effects, so that it is not possible to entirely attribute the determined extra-advances to the action of the dark matter distribution, especially for Mercury. A better way to use $\Delta\dot{\varpi}$ is to suitably combine them in order to make the estimate of ρ_{dm} independent, by construction, of the Lense-Thirring and J_2 effects. According to the approach followed in [6, 7], it is possible to construct the following combination

$$\rho_{\text{dm}} = \frac{\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Mer}} + c_1\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Ear}} + c_2\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Mar}}}{1.7 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ g}^{-1}}, \quad (22)$$

with $c_1 = -80.7$ and $c_2 = 217.6$. The dimensionless coefficients c_1 and c_2 , which are built up with a, e and i of the planets adopted, cancel out, by construction, the impact of the gravitomagnetic field and of the solar quadrupolar mass moment on the combination eq. (22). This can straightforwardly be checked by combining the perihelion precessions due to J_2 and to the Lense-Thirring force with the coefficients of eq. (22): the result is zero. The upper bound on ρ_{dm} obtainable from eq. (22) can conservatively be obtained from³

$$\delta\rho_{\text{dm}} \leq \frac{\delta(\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Mer}}) + |c_1|\delta(\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Ear}}) + |c_2|\delta(\Delta\dot{\varpi}^{\text{Mar}})}{1.7 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ g}^{-1}}; \quad (23)$$

it amounts to $4 \times 10^{-19} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

3.2 The mean longitudes

Here we compare the shifts in λ obtainable from eq. (21) with the formal errors in fitting the mean longitudes at epoch of all the nine major planets by using a data record spanning 90 years from Table 4 of [1]. Our results are in Table 1. As can be noted, the tightest constraint comes from Mars, with $5 \times 10^{-22} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. The present upper bounds are better than those obtained

³Although rather small, a certain amount of correlation among the determined extra-advances of perihelia is present, with a maximum of 20% between the Earth and Mars (E.V. Pitjeva, private communication, 2006). If a root-sum-square calculation is performed, an upper bound $\rho_{\text{dm}} \leq 3 \times 10^{-19} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ is obtained.

Table 1: Upper bounds, in g cm^{-3} , on ρ_{dm} from the comparison of the planetary mean longitude shifts over 90 years from eq. (21) and the formal errors in the planetary mean longitudes released in [1].

Mercury	4×10^{-19}
Venus	9×10^{-20}
Mars	5×10^{-22}
Jupiter	2×10^{-20}
Saturn	3×10^{-20}
Uranus	3×10^{-20}
Neptune	6×10^{-20}
Pluto	9×10^{-20}

Table 2: Secular precessions of longitudes of perihelia and mean longitudes, in arcseconds per century, induced on the outer planets by a dark matter density $\rho_{\text{dm}} = 10^{-16} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ equal to the upper bound found in [8].

Planet	$\dot{\omega}$	$\dot{\lambda}$
Jupiter	3.25	-4.349
Saturn	8.06	-10.803
Uranus	23.0	-30.807
Neptune	45	-60.27
Pluto	65.8	-97.03

in [4] from the perihelia of each planet, even if we conservatively assume that the realistic errors in λ may be one order of magnitude larger than those released in [1]. In regard to the constraint from Uranus $3 \times 10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, the previously obtained upper bound on ρ_{dm} from such a planet amounted to $10^{-16} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ [8]. From Table 2 it can be noted that with a such high value of ρ_{dm} the perihelia and the mean longitudes of the outer planets of Solar System would undergo very huge secular precessions up to tens of arcseconds per century. Such anomalous effects would have certainly been detected, even in the case of the outer planets whose orbital determination relies almost entirely upon relatively inaccurate optical data [1].

However, caution is advised in considering the results of Table 1 for each planet separately. It is so not only for the same reasons already exposed in

Section 3.1 about the unmodelled or mismodelled forces, but also because of the systematic errors $\delta n = (3/2)\sqrt{GM/a^5}\delta a$ in the Keplerian mean motions induced by the uncertainties in the semimajor axes⁴. Following the approach of Section 3.1, we can write down the combination

$$\rho_{\text{dm}} = \frac{\Delta\dot{\lambda}^{\text{Mer}} + k_1\Delta\dot{\lambda}^{\text{Ven}} + k_2\Delta\dot{\lambda}^{\text{Mar}}}{-2.4 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1} \text{ g}^{-1}}, \quad (24)$$

with $k_1 = -15.4$ and $k_2 = 78.1$. Also such a combination is independent of the solar Lense-Thirring and J_2 effects. The formal errors in λ of Table 4 of [1], combined according to eq. (24), yields a conservative upper bound $\delta\rho_{\text{dm}} \leq 7 \times 10^{-21} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. The errors in n , linearly combined according to eq. (24), yield a systematic bias $\delta\rho_{\text{dm}} \leq 7.7 \times 10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, so that a total upper bound $\delta\rho_{\text{dm}} \leq 7.8 \times 10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ can be obtained with the squared sum of these two kinds of errors. As can be noted, the use of eq. (24) yields better results than eq. (22).

4 Conclusions

In this paper we have worked out the effects that a local excess of dark matter in our Solar System over the galactic background would induce on the orbits of the planets. It turns out that, by modelling the dark matter distribution with a constant density, the longitude of perihelion and the mean longitude of a planet are affected by secular precessions. The comparison with the latest data show that the upper bounds obtainable from the mean longitudes and the perihelia are of the order of $10^{-20} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ and $10^{-19} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, respectively.

Acknowledgements

I thank I. Khriplovich, E.V. Pitjeva and M. Sereno for stimulating correspondence and useful observations. I am also grateful to the anonymous referee for his important remarks who greatly contributed to the improvement of the present paper.

⁴I am grateful to M. Sereno who pointed out this fact to me.

References

- [1] Pitjeva, E.V., High-Precision Ephemerides of Planets-EPM and Determinations of Some Astronomical Constants, *Sol. Sys. Res.*, **39**, 176, 2005a.
- [2] Gould, A., Gravitational diffusion of solar system WIMPs, *Astroph. J.*, **368**, 610-615, 1991.
- [3] Lundberg, J., and Edsjö, J., Weakly interacting massive particle diffusion in the solar system including solar depletion and its effect on Earth capture rates, *Phys. Rev. D*, **69**, 123505, 2004.
- [4] Khriplovich, I.B., and Pitjeva, E.V., Upper limits on density of dark matter in Solar system, *Int. J. of Mod. Phys. D*, accepted, astro-ph/0601422, 2006.
- [5] Pitjeva, E.V., Relativistic Effects and Solar Oblateness from Radar Observations of Planets and Spacecraft, *Astron. Lett.*, **31**, 340, 2005b.
- [6] Iorio, L., First preliminary evidence of the general relativistic gravitomagnetic field of the Sun and new constraints on a Yukawa-like fifth force, gr-qc/0507041, 2005a.
- [7] Is it possible to measure the Lense-Thirring effect on the orbits of the planets in the gravitational field of the Sun?, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **431**, 385-389, 2005b.
- [8] Anderson, J.D., Lau, E.L., Krisher, T.P., Dicus, D.A., Rosenbaum, D.C., and Teplitz, V.L., Improved Bounds on Nonluminous Matter in Solar Orbit, *Astroph. J.*, **448**, 885, 1995.